

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-17, 19, 21-23, 25-31, 33-38, and 40-43 are pending. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 18, 20, 24, 32, and 39 have been previously cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the January 28, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kim, US PG Pub 2004/0093461 ("the Kim reference"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,703 to Bolyn ("the Bolyn reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-9, 13-15, 23, 25-31, 33-38, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Kim reference in view of US Patent 6,871,261 to Proebsting ("the Proebsting reference") further in view of the Bolyn reference. The Examiner rejected claims 16-17, 19, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Kim, Proebsting, and Bolyn references as applied to claims 1-2, 6-9, 13-15, 23, 25-31, 33-38, and 40-43 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,303 to Zheng ("the Zheng reference"). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 specifies:

A method of operating a memory device having multiple memory bank arrays and being responsive to command signals and a plurality of bank address signals, the method comprising:

specifying at least one of a multiple of memory bank arrays to be refreshed using a plurality of bank address signals;

initiating in response to first command signals an auto-refresh command controlling an auto refresh operation to the specified at least one of the multiple memory bank arrays; and

initiating, before or during the auto refresh operation to the at least one of the specified memory bank arrays, a second command signal controlling a second operation, other than an auto refresh operation, to a second memory bank array of the multiple memory bank arrays, which is

not one of the at least one of the specified memory bank arrays being refreshed, **wherein multiple rows per memory bank array are refreshed in a staggered fashion per the auto-refresh command and the second operation begins after all the rows have begun the auto refresh operation.**

In the January 28, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner states that the Kim reference does not teach the last limitation of claim 1. (*Office Action, page 5*). The applicant agrees with the Examiner and respectfully submits that claim 1 distinguishes over the Kim reference.

The Examiner also states that the Proebsting reference discloses the non-bolded portion of the last limitation of claim 1. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner's statements are correct regarding the Proebsting reference, the Examiner also states that the Proebsting reference does not disclose a staggered refresh. (*Office Action, page 5*). The Applicant also agrees with the Examiner regarding the Proebsting reference not disclosing the staggered refresh and notes that the Examiner does not identify in the Proebsting reference where the bolded limitation of **the second operation begins after all the rows have begun the auto refresh operation** is disclosed. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 distinguishes over the Proebsting / Kim combination.

The Bolyn reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Proebsting and Kim references. The Examiner states that the Bolyn reference discloses a staggered refresh wherein multiple rows per memory bank are refreshed in a staggered fashion. (*Office Action, page 5*). The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Specifically, the Bolyn reference discloses a value of a refresh time spread out over a number of rows in each DRAM segment and the number of segments that are

supported by the memory board. This technique allows the Bolyn reference to stagger DRAM module refreshes. (*Bolyn*, col. 5, lines 29 – 33). This is not the same as **wherein multiple rows per memory bank array are refreshed in a staggered fashion per the auto-refresh command**. It is not the same because the Bolyn reference is referring to staggering the refreshes of DRAM modules, i.e., to stagger the module 1 refresh as compared to the module 2 refresh as compared to the module 3 refresh. There is no disclosure in the Bolyn reference that multiple rows per memory bank array are refreshed in a staggered fashion, as is recited in claim 1, only that module refreshes are staggered. Further, the Examiner does not indicate where the Bolyn reference discloses the second part of the bolded last limitation of claim 1, i.e., **the second operation begins after all the rows have begun the auto refresh operation**. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 distinguishes over the Kim / Proebsting / Bolyn combination.

Independent claims 5, 12, 26, 30, 33, 37 and 40 recite limitations similar to claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 12, 26, 30, 33, 37 and 40 distinguish over the Kim / Proebsting / Bolyn combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Claims 2, 6 – 9, 13, 14, 27 – 29, 31, 34 – 36, 38 and 41 – 43 depend, directly or indirectly, on independent claims 5, 12, 26, 30, 33, 37 and 40. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 6 – 9, 13, 14, 27 – 29, 31, 34 – 36, 38 and 41 – 43 distinguish over the Kim / Proebsting / Bolyn combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Independent claims 15 and 21 recite similar limitations to claim 1. Independent

claims 15 and 21 were further rejected under the Zheng reference. The Examiner states that the Zheng reference teaches an order of refreshing, i.e., wherein the at least one specified memory bank array of the multiple memory bank arrays is determined based on which memory bank arrays have been refreshed and a subsequent known order of refreshing the memory bank arrays. (*Office Action, page 17*). Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Zheng reference discloses all that the Examiner states that it does, the Zheng reference does not disclose **wherein multiple rows per memory bank array are refreshed in a staggered fashion per the auto-refresh command**, as is recited in claims 15 and 21. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 21 distinguish over the Zheng / Kim / Proebsting / Bolyn combination.

Claims 16, 17, 19, 22, 23 and 25 depend, directly or indirectly, on claims 15 and 21. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 16, 17, 19, 22, 23 and 25 distinguish over the Zheng / Kim / Proebsting / Bolyn combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claims 15 and 21.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///


///

Applicant believes that the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.


Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: May 28, 2008

By: 
Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: May 28, 2008

By: 
Mark R. Kendrick
Registration No. 48,468
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033